1

2

3

45

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

DAVID JACK ROGERS,

Petitioner,

v.

DOUG WADDINGTON.

Respondent.

Case No. C05-5332FDB

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO DENY APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Noted for July 8, 2005

This case has been referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Petitioner is an inmate at the Stafford Creek Corrections Center. Plaintiff paid the court filing fee, but then subsequently filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. # 1). Accordingly, because petitioner already has paid the filing fee, the Court should deny the application.

DISCUSSION

A district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed *in forma pauperis* upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). However, the court has broad discretion in denying an application to proceed in forma pauperis. <u>Weller v. Dickson</u>, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963), *cert. denied*, 375 U.S. 845 (1963).

On May 13, 2005, the Clerk received petitioner's petition, along with the court filing fee. (Dkt. #1). On May 19, 2005, plaintiff filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. #3). Because

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Page - 1

Case 3:05-cv-05332-FDB Document 5 Filed 06/14/05 Page 2 of 2

petitioner already has paid the filing fee, his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is moot.

CONCLUSION

Recause petitioner has paid the court filing fee, the undersigned recommends that the Court filing fee.

Because petitioner has paid the court filing fee, the undersigned recommends that the Court deny his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Fed. R. Civ. P."), petitioner shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file written objections thereto. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed set this matter for consideration on **July 8, 2005**, as noted in the caption.

DATED this 14th day of June, 2005.

Karen L. Strombom

United States Magistrate Judge